

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference signs 374 and 384 that are not mentioned in the description and because they fail to include reference signs 379 and 389.

Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 33-44 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 33-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaJoie et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,850,218 (hereinafter "LaJoie") in view of Knowles et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,505,348 (hereinafter "Knowles").

Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-16, 33-36, 38-42, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaJoie in view of Goode et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,163,272 (hereinafter "Goode").

Claims 5, 13, 37, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaJoie in view of Goode and in further view of Alexander et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 (hereinafter "Alexander").

Interview Summary

On June 30, 2004 and July 1, 2004, the Examiner, Mr. Philip Poh (Reg. No. 51,176), and the undersigned conducted telephonic interviews on the merits of the above-identified patent application. Applicants, Mr. Poh, and the undersigned wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interviews.

Mr. Poh, the undersigned, and the Examiner discussed the merits of the applicants' claims in view of LaJoie, Knowles, and Goode. The Examiner agrees that applicants' currently amended claims, as shown above in the Amendments to the Claims, overcome all the 103 rejections stated in the Final Office Action.

Applicants' Reply to the Final Office Action

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference signs 374 and 384 that are not mentioned in the description and because they fail to include reference signs 379 and 389. Applicants have amended the specification, as shown above in Amendments to the Specification, in order to make references to reference signs 379 and 389 and to delete references to reference signs 374 and 384.

Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 33-44 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 33-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaJoie in view of Knowles. Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-16, 33-36, 38-42, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaJoie in view of Goode. Claims 5, 13, 37, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaJoie in view of Goode and in further view of Alexander.

Independent claims 1, 9, 33, and 39 have been amended to more particularly define applicants' invention. As stated in the interview summary above, the Examiner agrees that applicants' amended claims 1, 9, 33, and 39 overcome the above 103 rejections in the Final Office Action. Claims 2-5, 8, 10-16, 34-38, and 40-44 depend from claims 1, 9, 33, and 39 and also overcome the above 103 rejections.

Conclusion

For at least those reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Cathy Ding
Reg. No. 52,820
Agent for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1104
Tel.: (212) 596-9000